

### REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on November 30, 2007, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 19 and 20 are amended and claims 7 and 14 are canceled; as a result, claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-21 are now pending in this application.

#### *§ 101 Rejection of the Claims*

Applicants have amended claims 19-20 accordingly. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 19-20 be withdrawn and such claims be allowed.

#### *§ 102 Rejection of the Claims*

Logan et al describes a method for selectively reproducing recorded video program segments retrieved from a mass storage device under the control of playlist metadata which identifies a selected set of the stored segments and the ordered sequences in which those segments are to be reproduced in the absence of an intervening control command from the viewer. In paragraph [0092], Logon describes metadata created by users may be shared directly between users. When shareable metadata exists at a user location, it may be "registered" by supplying its resources address to the remote location which then relays the URL to other users who directly access the descriptive metadata from the other user's metadata storage in a peer-to-peer transfer. In contrast, independent claims 1, 8, 15, 19 and 21 recite a method of enabling to identify a group of peers on a P2P network. Further, the method comprises enabling to use an identifier associated with a content broadcast for

identifying the group. Support for this can be found in page 3, lines 12-14. Furthermore, in Fig 2, a step 202 represents receiving the content broadcast, step 204, meta data is extracted from the broadcast. In a step 206, the meta data is analyzed for identifying one or more relevant P2P groups on network. In a step 208, connection is made to the group for further interaction. Support for this can be found in Fig. 2 and page 8, lines 5-9 of the present application.

Claims 2-6, 9-13, 16-18 and 20 are depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 8, 15 and 19 respectively, so they should be allowable for the reasons presented above.

For the above reasons, claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15-21 should be found allowable over Logan et al and Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15-21 be withdrawn.

*§ 103 Rejection of the Claims*

Claims 7 and 14 are canceled.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-21, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Prakash Nama  
Reg. 44, 255  
Att'y for Applicant(s)  
Global IP Services PLLC  
10 Crestwood Lane  
Nashua, NH 03062

Phone: 603-888-7958